

REMARKS

Applicant requests favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection set forth in the above-noted Office Action in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 11-17 remain pending, with claims 11 and 17 being independent. Claims 11 and 17 have been amended herein. Support for the amendments can be found throughout the originally-filed disclosure. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the amendments do not include new matter.

Claims 11-17 are rejected in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Teraura (U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2002/0170973) in view of Petteruti et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,409,401) and Ostrover et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,585,154).

Applicant additionally notes that the Office Action refers to a “112 2nd rejection” at item number 5 on page 4. In this regard, the Office Action states that the “limitations of the output device are not being addressed” and “the limitations for the managing device depend from the output device and are not being addressed for the same reason.” The Office Action, however, does not identify what claims are rejected under Section 112, the grounds for the Section 112 rejection (i.e. claim language that is indefinite), or otherwise explain the Section 112 rejection. Until an articulated reason for a Section 112 rejection is provided, Applicant cannot respond to such a rejection. Accordingly, if the Office does still intend to make a Section 112 rejection in view of the claims that have been amended herein, Applicant kindly requests clarification as to why the claims are being so rejected.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Section 103 rejection set forth in the Office Action, and submits that the claimed invention is patentably distinguishable from the cited references for at least the following reasons.

Amended independent claim 11 recites a content information system that comprises, inter alia, first and second determination devices. The second determination device is adapted to determine whether or not the contents information to be output is registered, and further determine, when it is determined that the contents information to be output is registered, whether or not the registered contents information is corrected. The content information system further comprises output and management devices operable, in part, on the basis of the determinations of the second determination device regarding registration and correction of the contents information.

As discussed in Applicant's amendment filed November 17, 2008, which is hereby incorporated by reference, the citations to Teraura, Petteruti et al., and Ostrover et al. do not disclose or suggest a determination with respect to both the registration and correction of contents information. Applicant maintains this position.

In response to the Applicant's arguments submitted with the November 17, 2008, the Office Action asserts that the previous claim language was in alternative format by its use of the "and/or" conjunction. Thus, the Office Action asserts that only one aspect of claim language need be taught by the references, and, more particularly, that the determination if the contents information has been corrected need not be found in the references in order to reject the claims.

By this amendment, Applicant has deleted the "and/or" conjunction, and otherwise more positively claimed the determination with respect to correction of the contents information. Thus, Applicant submits that the interpretation of the claim language set forth in the Office Action is no longer applicable. That is, the claim language requires a determination as to whether contents information has been both registered and corrected. The Office Action does not find the features of claims relating to the correction of contents information as disclosed or

suggested by Teraura, Petteruti et al., and Ostrover et al., and, in Applicant's view, the references do not teach such features.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that the references cited in the Office Action fail to disclose or suggest the invention recited in amended independent claim 11.

Amended independent claim 17 recites a contents information output method that comprises determination, output, and management steps analogous to the determination, output, and management devices recited in independent claim 11. Thus, Applicant submits that independent claim 17 is patentably distinguishable from the cited references for the same reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 11.

The dependent claims are allowable for reciting features in addition to those recited in independent claim 11. Individual consideration of the dependent claims is requested.

Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection set forth in the Office Action, and a Notice of Allowability are requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. Office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Donald H. Heckenberg, Jr./

Donald H. Heckenberg, Jr.
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 60,081

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCBS_WS 3272093_1.DOC